

REMARKS

[0003] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 47-49 and 51-54 are presently pending. Claims 47, 49, 51 and 54 are amended herein.

Statement of Substance of Interview

[0004] The Examiner graciously talked with me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—on December 5, 2008. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner's willingness to talk. Such willingness is invaluable to both of us in our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application.

[0005] During the interview, I discussed how the claims differed from the cited references, namely Knee and Throckmorton. Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, I also proposed several possible clarifying amendments.

[0006] The Examiner was receptive to the proposals, specifically the clarification regarding the user associates the user entered additional URLs identifying target resources with a particular program or channel in the EPG. However, the Examiner indicated that he would need to review the cited art more carefully and do another search, and requested that the proposed amendments be presented in writing.

[0007] Applicant herein amends the claims in the manner discussed during the interview. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the pending claims are

allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0008] If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0009] Please contact me to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for me, I welcome your call as well. My contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments and Additions

[0010] Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 47, 49, 51 and 54 herein. Applicant amends claims to clarify claimed features. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and more quickly identify allowable subject matter. Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features, and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to the cited references.

Formal Matters

[0011] This section addresses any formal matters (e.g., objections) raised by the Examiner.

Claims

[0012] The Examiner objects to claims 51 for improperly depending from a canceled claim. Herein, Applicant amends claim 51, as shown above, to address the objection made by the Examiner, and to expedite prosecution.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under §103(a)

[0013] Claims 47-49 and 51-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,589,982 to Knee in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,818,441 to Throckmorton.

[0014] In light of the amendments and arguments presented herein and the decisions/agreements reached during the above-discussed Examiner interview, Applicant submits that these rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

Obviousness Rejections

Lack of *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness (MPEP § 2142)

[0015] Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's obviousness rejections. Arguments presented herein point to various aspects of the record to demonstrate that all of the criteria set forth for making a *prima facie* case have not been met.

Independent Claim 47

[0016] Applicant submits that the combination of Knee and Throckmorton does not teach or suggest at least the following elements as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- “enable a user of the user interface to enter additional URLs identifying target resources that contain supplemental information related to the particular program; and”

[0017] The Examiner indicates (Action, p. 4) the following with regard to this claim:

Knee does not specifically disclose that the URLs are of *Internet URLs* and that the EPOG rec.

enable a user of the user interface to enter additional URLs identifying target resources that contain supplemental information related to the particular program.

However, in an analogous art, Throckmorton teaches a system that allows additional interactivity by adding a two way communication channel to the user interface so that online services or the Internet may be accessed using associated data that contains pointers to locations (Internet URLs) in the online services or the Internet which are relevant to the TV program (see at least Abstract; FIG. 5; 3:55-67; 6:54 - 7:12; 7:36-52; 8:16 - 9:25).

[0018] Applicant appreciates the Examiner acknowledging that Knee does not teach or suggest enabling “a user of the user interface to enter additional URLs identifying target resources that contain supplemental information related to the particular program.” Applicant would respectfully traverse the Examiner’s contention that Throckmorton does teach these elements.

[0019] The most relevant portion of Throckmorton pointed out by the Examiner states (See Throckmorton, Col. 9, lines 1-15):

The addition of a two-way communication channel allows a consumer to also access online services. In this case, associated data may consist of references such as uniform resource locations ("URL") which are WWW page references. Associated data may include references to Internet News Groups which are shared static messages grouped by topic which may be accessed. Associated data may also include references to Internet Relay Chat areas which are multi-person dynamic conversation streams that enable users to communicate by text messages. Or, associated data may include pointers to information on an online service such as America Online, Prodigy or Compuserve. Thus a menu may list several references. And by clicking on a reference, the system actually connects to and retrieves the referenced information from the appropriate source.

[0020] As can be understood by reading the cited portion, a consumer can access online services that may consist of references such as a uniform resource locations ("URL"). But accessing is different than a user having the ability to **enter** additional URLs identifying additional target resources.

[0021] As explained in the present application, an EPG can have a predefined list of target specifications or URL that a viewer or user can utilize to access supplemental information. (See Application, pg. 21, lines 21-22). In addition, it is beneficial for the user to be able to enter additional target specifications or URLs to further customizes the EPG to the user's interests.

[0022] Throckmorton fails to disclose a user being able to enter additional URLs. Throckmorton instead teaches that a list of URLs or pointers can be provided to allow a user to access additional reference information. The accessing of predefined URLs is different than enabling “a user of the user interface to enter additional URLs identifying target resources that contain supplemental information related to the particular program”. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of independent claim 47.

[0023] Independent claim 47 further clarifies that “the user associates the user entered additional URLs identifying target resources with a particular program or channel in the EPG”. As the cited art fails to teach a user entering additional URLs, the cited art fails to teach that the user associates the entered URL’s with a particular program or channel in the EPG.

[0024] As shown above, the combination of Knee and Throckmorton does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 48

[0025] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 47. As discussed above, claim 47 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Independent Claim 49

[0026] Applicant submits that the combination of Knee and Throckmorton does not teach or suggest at least the following elements as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- “entering a target specification into the supplemental content field to correlate supplemental content with a program, the target specification identifying a location for the supplemental content, wherein the entering a target specification into the supplemental content field comprises receiving the target specification from a viewer accessing an EPG user interface (UI) supported by the EPG”

[0027] The cited references, namely Knee and Throckmorton, do not teach or suggest a viewer is able to enter additional target specification to identify target resources that contain supplemental information related to the particular program.

[0028] Independent claim 49 further clarifies that “the user associates the user entered additional URLs identifying target resources with a particular program or channel in the EPG”. As the cited art fails to teach a user entering additional URLs, the cited art fails to teach that the user associates the entered URL’s with a particular program or channel in the EPG.

[0029] As such, the combination of cited art does not render claim 49 obvious.

Dependent Claims 51-53

[0030] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 49. As discussed above, claim 49 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Independent Claim 54

[0031] Applicant submits that the combination of Knee and Throckmorton does not teach or suggest at least the following elements as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- “correlating user entered hyperlinks with corresponding programming information in the EPG, wherein the user enters the hyperlinks through an EPG user interface (UI) supported by the EPG and **associates the hyperlink with a particular program or channel in the EPG**”

[0032] The cited references, namely Knee and Throckmorton, do not teach or suggest a viewer is able to enter additional hyperlinks through an EPG user interface. Further, the cited art does not teach or suggest associating the hyperlink with a particular program or channel in the EPG. As such, the combination of cited art does not render claim 54 obvious.

Conclusion

[0033] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call or email me at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representatives for Applicant

/Jason F. Lindh Reg. No. 59,090/ Dated: 2008-12-05
Jason F. Lindh (jason@leehayes.com; x215)
Registration No. 59,090
Customer No. **22801**

Telephone: (509) 324-9256
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979
www.leehayes.com